

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. Claims 2, 4, 6-10, 13, 15, and 18-20 have been amended without prejudice, Claims 1, 3, 5, and 17 have been cancelled without prejudice, and Claims 21-24 have been added, leaving Claims 2, 4, 6-16, and 18-24 for consideration upon entry of the present Amendment. As support for the amended claims is found in the Specification, Figures, and Claims as originally filed, no new matter is included in the amended claims. More specifically, Claims 6, 15, 16, and 18 have been amended to overcome the § 112, 2nd paragraph rejections. Claim 13 has been amended to consist of an independent claim and has incorporated all of the limitations of its corresponding independent claim and intervening dependent claims. Claims 21-24 find support at Page 1, lines 8-9, Page 7, lines 13-22, and Page 15, line 13 – Page 16, line 2 of the Specification and in the Claims as originally filed. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph

Claims 5, 6, and 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, as allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. More particularly, regarding Claims 5, 15, and 17, the Examiner argues that the metes and bounds of the claims cannot be determined due to the phrase “and/or”. Claims 5 and 17 have been cancelled without prejudice leaving this claim rejection moot. The remainder of the claims have been amended without prejudice to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-3 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,073,071 to Angelotti (“Angelotti”). Claims 1 and 3 have been cancelled without prejudice making this claim rejection moot. Furthermore, Claims 2 and 9 have been amended without prejudice to claim dependency to Claim 6, wherein the

Examiner has conditionally allowed Claim 6. In view of the amendments made to Claim 6, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 3-5, 7, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,391,106 to Lidert ("Lidert"). Claims 3 and 5 have been cancelled without prejudice making the rejection of these claims moot. Furthermore, Claims 4, 7, and 8 have been amended without prejudice to claim dependency to Claim 6, wherein the Examiner has conditionally allowed Claim 6. In view of the amendments made to Claim 6, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 5, 17, 19, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Angelotti in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,096,645 to Mandl ("Mandl"). Claims 5 and 17 have been cancelled without prejudice making the rejection of these claims moot. Furthermore, Claims 19 and 20 have been amended without prejudice to claim dependency to Claim 18, wherein the Examiner has conditionally allowed Claim 18. In view of the amendments made to Claim 18, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 10-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Angelotti in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,120,229 to Moore et al. ("Moore"). Claim 10 has been amended without prejudice to claim dependency to Claim 6, wherein the Examiner has conditionally allowed Claim 6. Due to the amendment made to Claim 10, Claims 11 and 12 now incorporate all of the limitations of Claim 6. In view of the amendments made to Claim 6, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6, 15, 16, and 18 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Additionally, Claims 13 and 14 are objected to as

being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has amended Claims 6, 15, and 18 to overcome the § 112, 2nd paragraph rejection, and has amended Claim 13 to include all of the limitations of its independent and intervening dependent claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that these claims now stand allowed.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration by the Examiner is respectfully requested. It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks fully comply with the Office Action and that the claims herein should now be allowable to Applicant.

Respectfully submitted,

DOHERTY, WALLACE, PILLSBURY &
MURPHY, P.C.

By Deborah A. Basile

Deborah A. Basile

Registration No. 35,439

Customer No. 42,325